UNITED STATES DIST EASTERN DISTRICT (OF NEW YORK	
IRVIN KRUKENKAMF	X 9,	
	Plaintiff(s),	ORDER CV 04-0569 (TCP) (WDW)
-against-		(
SUNY AT STONY BRO	OOK, et al.,	
	Defendant(s).	
WALL, Magistrate Jud		

At the conference held on July 5, 2005,¹ plaintiff requested permission to conduct *ex parte* interviews with employees of the corporate defendant Stony Brook University Hospital ("SBUH"). The court granted this request, but to protect against the potential disclosure of privileged information, directed defendants to provide a written list of employees whose statements would bind the defendants. Both the request and the ruling were made orally, and no written order was issued.

On August 5, 2005, defendants submitted a letter asking the court to adopt an approach whereby defendants would provide a list of all SBUH employees, plaintiff would identify the proposed interviewees, and defendants could then object, if necessary. Plaintiff opposed this request for numerous reasons in a letter dated August 10, 2005.

Defendants' request is, in effect, a motion to reconsider the court's ruling of July 5, 2005, and as such, is untimely. *See* Local Civil Rule 6.3. Even if the request had been timely, defendants have presented no argument that would persuade the court to revise its earlier ruling.

Defendants shall produce the written list ordered by the court no later than close of business on **August 18, 2005.** Given the length of time that has passed since the court's ruling and the upcoming summary judgment argument and trial date, no extension of this deadline will

¹Defendants mistakenly identify June 22, 2005 as the date of the conference at which the subject order was entered.

be granted. If defendants fail to provide the list by that date, the court will entertain a motion for sanctions for each day the list is late.

Dated: Central Islip, New York August 12, 2005 **SO ORDERED:**

/s/ William D. Wall WILLIAM D. WALL

United States Magistrate Judge